

CULTURAL-HISTORICAL PRELIMINARIES TO THE FORMATION OF THE SLOVENIAN NATIONAL LITERARY LANGUAGE. PART I

Károly Gadányi

(Gadányi Károly, Berzsenyi Dániel Tanárképző Főiskola, Szláv Filológiai Intézet
H-9700 Szombathely, Berzsenyi tér 2.)

1. The medieval scribal tradition and the enrichment of the Slovenian literary vocabulary in the nineteenth century

The oldest monument of Slovenian writing – the "Freising Fragments" ("Brižinski spomeniki") – dates to the tenth–eleventh centuries. The "Freising Fragments" confirm certain assumptions about the common language of the Slovenians at that time. The earliest example of Slovenian cultic language at our disposal, they contain numerous Church Slavonic elements which significantly distinguish its language from that of everyday speech. In addition to the three texts which comprise the "Freising Fragments," there are certain similar monuments of Old Slovenian writing of later vintage from various sites in Carinthia and Styria. The best known of these is the "Celovski Manuscript" (or "Rateški rokopis"), which dates from 1362–1390 and is written in the Gorenjsko dialect (with some features of the adjacent Elski dialect, a member of the Carinthian dialectal group: *ě* > *e* – *dělo*; *ō* > *o* – *gospod*; *stj* > *š* – *krščanstvu*; *jast* – and other features). The "Stiški Manuscript," dated from 1428–1440, is written in the Dolenjsko dialect. Both of these manuscripts contain texts which are spiritual in content. The Venetian-Slovenian or "Čedadski Manuscript" ("Beneško-slovenski rokopis") of 1497 is an administrative-ecclesiastical text in the Terski dialect (of the Venetian dialectal group) interpolated in a Latin manuscript. This text displays the influence of the Čakavian dialect of Croatian. In the archives of the city of Kranj there are a number of juridical texts and oaths which date from the second half of the fifteenth century.

The manuscript period in the history of written Slovenian is characterized by an utter absence of continuity, which is reflected in the

graphic formulation of these manuscripts as well. The written language of the church could not meet all the needs of Slovenian feudal society in the period of its most intensive development. On the one hand, the need arose for various types of juridical and commercial documents. On the other hand, excerpts of knightly and popular church song preserved in certain manuscripts indicate that troubador poetry – as an element of the so-called "Gothic" (lexical and syntactic) formation – was not alien to the Slovenian language at this time.

The development of religious literary genres proceeded even more intensively. Gradually two varieties of written language – ecclesiastical and secular – came into being among the Slovenes.

The introduction of Slovenian language book-printing in the mid-sixteenth century ushers in a new epoch in the history of the Slovenian culture and language. Primarily employing the Ljubljana dialect with an admixture of features from Gorenjsko and Dolenjsko (the two central dialects), Primož Trubar laid a foundation for the Slovenian literary-written language in his catechism, the first Slovenian book.¹

The activities of Trubar and his collaborators in creating a Slovenian written language were highly fruitful. During the second half of the sixteenth century more than twenty books were printed in Slovenian. These include the first alphabet primers and a portion of the New Testament. This period also witnessed the appearance of the first grammatical and lexicographical descriptions of the Slovenian language – A. Bohorič's grammar, J. Dalmatin's lexical guide to the Slovenian translation of the Bible, and I. Megiser's German-Latin-Slovenian-Italian dictionary, among others.

This very important stage in the development of written Slovenian is also marked by an adaptation of Latin orthography which more effec-

¹ For a long time it was thought that the Slovenian language as spoken in Trubar's native village of Pashchitsa (which lies within the Dolenjsko dialectical zone) served as the basis for the language of the first printed texts in Slovenian. Scholars of Slovenian have recently begun to support the hypothesis advanced by J. Rigler (1968: 100-110), according to which the dialectical basis of the earliest printed literary monuments is that of Ljubljana, the administrative and cultural center of Slovenia, which is located on the border between the Gorenjsko and Dolenjsko dialectical zones.

tively renders the sound system of Slovenian than those earlier and limited attempts found in various texts written in Latin and German.

During this period the normative basis of the Slovenian language – still only partially codified in its grammar – comprised two variants of written language: Carinthian-Gorenjsko and Dolenjsko. Both were superimposed on the urban koine of Ljubljana.

2. Slovenian translations of the Bible as an ethnocultural determinant

Translations of the Bible into the native languages of the Slavs exerted a significant influence on the development of Slavic national-literary languages in the nineteenth century, particularly in the area of lexicon.

The first thing to strike the observant researcher is the near synchronic appearance of the first printed Bibles, in whole or in part, among the majority of the Slavic peoples. Without delving into the historical details, we will merely mention that the first translation of the Bible among the Southern Slavs was made in 1568 by the Protestants P. Trubar, J. Dalmatin, and A. Bohorič.

Slavistics has now provided us with sufficient proof that the Slovenian literary language was originally based on the Dolenjsko dialect. Trubar (1508–1586), the first Slovenian writer to occupy himself with language reform, was a native of the village of Raščic kod Velikih Lašča. He employed his native dialect as the linguistic basis for his literary works, into which he also introduced elements of the Ljubljana dialects, which, as in our own time, occupied the border area between the Dolenjsko and Gorenjsko dialects. P. Trubar's circle attracted like-minded writer-reformers whose native speech represented a variety of dialects natively. The Dolenians Juri Dalmatin (1547–1589) and Adam Bohorič (circa 1520 – circa 1600) had a sound command of the linguistic norm fixed in Trubar's texts. However, it is important to note that even at that time they realized that they were writing not only for Dolenians but for other Slovenes; for this reason they consciously introduced Gorenjsko elements into their works. Sebastian Krel (1538–1567), another well-known writer during the epoch of Slovenian Protestantism, was a native of Vipava who enriched the Slovenian written language with features of

the Notranjsko dialect. As an educated man with modern views on literature and language, Krel replaced many of Trubar's Germanisms with equivalent Slovenian words and expressions. In doing so he strengthened rather than undermined the achievements of Trubar with respect to the written language.

It is no exaggeration to state that the literary language of the Slovenian Protestants was codified in Dalmatin's translation of the Bible and in Bohorič's grammar (*Articae Horulae*) published in Wittenberg in 1584. For many years thereafter the language of the Slovenian Bible constituted the written norm for educated Slovenians, especially following the publication in 1613 of a lectionary entitled *Evangelija inu listuvi*.

The significance of Dalmatin's translation for the history of Slovenian reflects a phenomenon which is typical of the Slavic languages in general. In most cases, the first native-language translations of parts of the Bible among one or another of the Slavic peoples (which, as a rule, predated the advent of printing) appeared before or at the same time as the first attempts to normativize the Slavic literary language in question. Such was the case with the first complete Czech translation of the Bible, which dates to the time of the orthographic reforms undertaken by Jan Hus. In this sense, František Skorina's "*Biblija ruska*" and Ivan Fedorov's "*Ostrozhskii Biblia*" can be regarded as two models which prepared the ground for the emergence of three closely-related but independent literary languages – Russian, Ukrainian, and Byelorussian.

As a result of the practices employed in the first Slovenian translation of the Bible, it took on the status of an authoritative model for subsequent generations of Southern Slavic language reformers. Furthermore, we should not forget that among the Southern Slavs the first translation of the Scriptures on the basis of contemporaneous popular speech was carried out by Slovenian Protestants. In so doing they opened the way for a distinctive tradition characterized by two prominent features: an idiosyncratic democratization of the language of translations, whereby a gradual departure is made from Biblical texts in ancient bookish-literary Slavic languages and Latin; and second, the efforts on the part of national "awakeners" and codifiers in the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries to employ these translations as a means for

elevating the social prestige and significance of the national literary language.

In connection with this subject we would like to mention Rado Lenček's model of cultural development with respect to the peoples of the Slavic world (Lenček 1968: 57-71). Lenček's model is based on three primary components: translation of the Bible into a given Slavic language, the creation of a grammar for that particular language, and the appearance of a poet writing in that language. It is significant that Lenček illustrates his ideas by reference to Slovenia. In Lenček's opinion, the sociocultural development of Slovenia in the pre-national and national periods rested on three principal events: Dalmatin's translation of the Bible; the grammar of A. Bohorič (1584); and the poetry of F. Prešern (first half of the nineteenth century).

Let us now look at the first Slovenian translations of the Bible in terms of their vocabulary. The subject is all the more important since research has not yet taken up the question as to which part of the lexicon employed in the Trubar-Dalmatin-Bohorič translation has been preserved in contemporary Slovenian literary usage.

As a practical matter in the study of the vocabulary of the Slovenian Protestants, research must address the terminology of Christian worship, three quarters of which, according to certain scholars, is either identical or formally and semantically very similar to the Old Church Slavic lexicon (Havránek 1936: 4). These include the forms for such notions as: "to bless," "spirit," "soul," "Lord," "sin," "to repent," "hypocrite," "mercy," "to pray," "hope," "faith," and many others which are an indispensable part of the lexicon of contemporary literary Slovenian.

Below we list some examples of Slovenian liturgical vocabulary (in contemporary orthography) which we have extracted from Dalmatin's translations of the Bible: *angel*, *apstol*=*apoštel*, *avemarija*, *amen*, *antikrist*; *blago*, *blagosloviti*, *blaznivost*, *Bog*=*Bug*, *boštvo*, *bogaima*, *bogabojec*, *bratovščina*; *ceremonija*, *cirkev*=*cerkev*, *cermoniški*, *cerkoven*; *domnenie*, *desnica*=*pravica* (*Božja*), *dobrota*, *dobrotljivost*, *dragota*, *duh*, *duhovski*, *duša*; *gorivstajanje*, *greh*, *grešnik*, *grešiti*, *Gospod*, *glagol*=*beseda*; *hudič*=*Sotona*=*Sotonika*; *izkušovan*, *izkušnjevac*; *kadilo*, *kaplan*, *kaplanija*, *klečoč*, *keršanstvo*, *kajati se*, *kletev*, *kristjan*, *krivodejanje*, *krst*=*križ*, *krstčanski*, *krščanstvo*, *krščenica*, *krščenik*, *krstiti se*, *Krist*, *Krščovanje*; *maša*, *mašnik*,

menih, menihstvo = menihštvo, milost, milostivost, modrost, molitev, molitva, moljenje, mrtvec; navuk (nebeski, krščanski), nabožanstvo, neistota, nesreča, nevera, nepokorka, nemilost, nedelja (sveta), nevolja, nežadost, norec, norost, norški; oblačilo, opatriti, očenaš = očanaš, odločenje, otrok, orvočič, otročnica; papežni, papežnikov, pastir, pijanec, plésen, počet, pokopanje, pokora, post, paštenje, poštovan, pot, prepoved, prepovedanje, prešernost, priča, prijatelj, prijazniv, prisegovanje, prošnja; rodovit; skrivnost, slabost, sloboden, slepota, služba (Božja), sodba, sovražnik, spodoba, stid i sram = sramota, starost, strah, strahoviten, sveti, svetec, svetost, svitinja; težkost, tihost, tožba; ubijen, užitek; vbojnik, večnost; zahvaljenje, zakon (Božji), zakonski, zblaznjen, zblaznjenje, zdravje, zlaga, zlobost, žalost, žalosten, žegnovanje, žetev, život, živost, žrtva. (Many dozens of other such words could have been included in this list.)

Analysis of the lexicon of the first Slovenian Bible translations enables us to delineate with sufficient precision the functional sphere of the Slovenian "cultic language" during the epoch of Latin supremacy in public worship on Slovenian ethnic territory. Such supremacy was a relative matter, since the Church could not avoid addressing the faithful in their native language. Oral sermons were the vehicle through which the Slovenian literary language received, albeit with some transformation, a significant layer of the lexicon established by the followers of Cyril and Methodius.

With respect to the theme of our work, there are sound reasons for viewing Slovenian translations of the Bible as an objective and authoritative ethnocultural determinant.

3. Features of linguistic communication in Slovenian during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries

The style of the Slovenian Protestant texts indicates the originality of the Slovenian Reformation, which unfolded under the strong influence of Humanism. In view of its purely religious aspirations, the Slovenian Reformation produced very few writings of a secular nature; nonetheless, the Protestant texts as a whole are characterized by considerable generic variety. The texts also display a diverse assortment of dialectical features. On the whole, the Slovenian creation of strictly bookish-literary idioms on a popular base – a phenomenon influenced

by ideas of the Reformation – attests to democratization in the language situation. The appearance of literary idioms derived from popular speech instigated competition between Slovenian and non-native languages (Latin and German, as well as Italian and Hungarian) and led to a constriction of the functional spheres of the latter. Simultaneously, penetration of the bookish language of the Slovenian Protestants with its popular-conversational base into rather elevated cultural spheres widened the communicative possibilities of the vernacular, whose use as a written language had theretofore been limited. True, in the seventeenth century during the period of reaction and Counter-Reformation a gradual deviation from sixteenth-century traditions can be observed on Slovenian territory. But notwithstanding the relatively unpropitious general atmosphere in Europe, the Baroque epoch of the seventeenth century in Slovenia can be regarded as a period in which the cultural tradition of the literary language underwent broadening in the area of written usage. Such progress was more a matter of "in spite of" rather than "owing to" – for instance, the Counter-Reformation delayed the appearance of new Slovenian grammars and dictionaries for a number of decades. Baroque elements penetrated written Slovenian with particular intensity in the areas of genre, composition, and stylistics. The Gorenjsko dialects are the most influential during this period.

Linguistic communication in Slovenian at this time is distinguished by its social diversity. According to most Slovenian historians, in seventeenth and eighteenth-century Slovenia the nobility and prosperous city dwellers (who were primarily of German or Italian nationality, whereas the peasants and poorer urban population were Slovenian) used German, Latin, and Italian in all communicative spheres, while the use of Slovenian was exclusively restricted to the lower classes (who were ethnically Slovenian).

New material undermines this view. Admittedly, by the middle of the eighteenth century a distinctive linguistic hierarchy had been established. The summit was occupied by Latin, which though constantly slipping from its position was still preserved in the church affairs, scholarship, and education. Italian, the language spoken by the highest level of society, occupied the second rank and was followed by German, the language of official documents, the bureaucracy, prosperous city

dwellers, and the intelligentsia. At the bottom of the hierarchy were Slavic languages, including Slovenian – the language of the lowest layers of the urban population, the serfs, and the peasants (Melik 1979: 421–424). Nonetheless, evidence of widespread employment of Slovenian among certain families of the nobility and wealthier city dwellers suggests that the status of Slovenian at this time was significantly higher and its communicative function considerably wider than has usually been thought.

The national library in Vienna holds three books which contain notes of interviews with entrants into the Jesuit order. From 1648 through 1737 the Jesuits took in forty-two applicants from the Slovenian lands, most of whom belonged to the ranks of the nobility or the urban population. Of the twenty who came from Krajna all spoke Slovenian. Moreover, when questioned about their knowledge of languages, seventeen mentioned Slovenian as their first language (Чуркина 1985: 189).

Until the middle of the eighteenth century the gentry in Krajna was bilingual, according to some scholars (Чуркина 1985: 189). Such a situation is suggested by the correspondence in Slovenian of certain gentry families in Inner Krajna, Trieste (Gorica) and other localities. In this period there was no stigma attached to the use of Slovenian on the part of the gentry, who employed it together with German and Italian. This was particularly the case in the central Slovenian province of Krajna. Among those Jesuits who delivered sermons in Slovenian during the first half of the eighteenth century were two barons – Ludwig Neuhaus and Daniel Valvasor. The latter was the author of the celebrated encyclopediac account of the Duchy of Kranj (Valvasor 1689), in which he asserts that during the seventeenth century Slovenian was the language of official communications on that territory. His book includes a detailed description of the features of this language in a chapter entitled *The Kranjsko-Slovenian language* (Rupel 1969: 170–213).

Slovenian was even more widely diffused among the townspeople of Kranj. In 1750, for instance, with the exception of those in Ljubljana, Novo Mesto, and Krško, all municipal judges took their oaths of office in Slovenian. In the following decades profound changes in the situation served to decrease the use of Slovenian. The Germanization of Slovenian towns proceeded at a rapid pace in the wake of the reforms associated

with Maria Theresia and Joseph II. Similar processes took place in other Slavic territories of the Habsburg Empire, particularly in Czech towns.

From the end of the seventeenth century through the first quarter of the eighteenth century Slovenian was rather seldom employed in literary and scholarly works. We have already mentioned the "hierarchy" of languages in place on Slovenian territory. Literature and scholarship were primarily written in Latin, as was the case throughout the Austrian Empire at this time. German was only used in those cases where authors composed their works for the widest possible readership. That German did not occupy the leading position in the Habsburg monarchy prior to the mid-eighteenth century is suggested by the fact that the faculty of German at the University of Vienna was not established until 1749 (Мыльников 1977: 17).

Spoken Slovenian was rather widely employed in the church, where it served as the primary homiletic language. In the case of literature, Slovenian was used as a language of "low style." For example, in the Croatian translation of Moliere's "Georges Danden" the servants and other lower-class characters speak in Slovenian. An identical function was assigned to Slovenian in primarily German language theatrical performances put on for the citizens of Kranj. The use of Slovenian was particularly common in scenes involving peasant weddings. Slovenian rarely figured as a "high style" language. One example thereof can be found in the above-mentioned book by D. Valvasor, into which a certain Jozef Zizenceli placed a Slovenian ode written in praise of the work.

The first Slovenian translations of legal codes appeared in 1754, 1764, and 1766.

As a consequence of the Counter-Reformation no books in Slovenian were published from 1615 to 1672. In the latter year Janez Ljudevik Schenleben, bishop of Ljubljana, issued a collection in which the Gospels and a catechism appeared in Slovenian translation together with some Slovenian hymns. At the end of the seventeenth century spiritual literature in Slovenian was published by the Novo Mesto canon Matija Kaštelič, the capucin Janez Svetokrižski, the Jesuit Ernei Basar and others. The eighteenth century in the Slovenian lands can be generally regarded as a time in which unsubstantially normativized Slovenian linguistic practice developed sporadically, both in central and peripheral territories (Ljubljana, Carinthia, Styria, Prekmurje), and stabilized local

linguistic elements (especially lexical elements) which in many ways have retained their local character into our day.

4. The Slovenian language as the primary element of national consciousness

Numerous currently available sources affirm that the first shoots of Slovenian national consciousness emerged at the end of the seventeenth and in the first quarter of the eighteenth centuries. In the previously mentioned Jesuit books many Kranjian entrants into the order indicated that Slovenian was their "lingua nativa" (Koruza 1975/1976: 107). Intellectual activity in Slovenian continued in this period: at the beginning of the eighteenth century the Novo Mesto canon Matija Kaštelic wrote a Latin-Slovenian dictionary, which Francisk Ksaverij, a monk at the Diskaltsiatski monastery in Ljubljana, prepared for publication (though it was never printed). Ksaverij (whose secular name was Gregor Vorants) wrote a number of works in Slovenian which, like Ksaverij's dictionary, remained in manuscript form. The Ksaverij-Kastelič manuscripts were subsequently used by M. Pohlin (Koruza 1977: 6).

In the beginning of the eighteenth century the capucin Hippolit (the former Adam Gaiger of Novo Mesto who lived from 1667-1722) compiled his Latin-German-Slovenian dictionary. He invented new words which subsequently entered Slovenian literary usage. In the foreword to his dictionary he criticized younger priests who, in his opinion, perverted the Slovenian language by introducing many German expressions into their Slovenian sermons. In matters of language Hippolit was a follower of G.B. Leibniz, for whom the most important features of any developed language were an ample lexicon, stylistic purity, and brilliance of style (Domej 1979: 197). Unfortunately Hippolit's dictionary and his translations of the works of Jan Amos Komenski, the famous Czech pedagogue, remained unpublished. He managed only to publish a few religious books in Slovenian and another edition of A. Bohorič's Slovenian grammar. Hippolit retained Bohorič's preface which was permeated with ideas of Slavic unity. It would seem that Bohorič's ideas accorded with Hippolit's outlook (Slodnjak 1968: 49).

The interest of educated Slovenes in their native language and its cultivation surely testifies to an embryonic national consciousness on

their part. In 1758 the Carinthian Jesuits published another edition of Bohorič's grammar in Celovec (Klagenfurt). Although they omitted Bohorič's preface, the publishers expressed their regret that many Slovenes did not wish to study Slovenian, and they summoned both the nobility and the common people to use it for purposes of commercial as well as "routine" communication. The Carinthian Jesuits still confused the notions "Slovenian" and "Slavic," treating them as synonymous terms.

The most notable forerunner of the Slovenian national revival was Janez Žiga Popovič (1705-1774), a prominent scholar who chaired the department of German at the University of Vienna from 1753 to 1766. A man of encyclopediac education, Popovič knew not only German but Slavic languages as well. In his "Untersuchungen vom Meere" of 1750 he stressed the contributions which a study of the Slavic languages could make to the development of philology. Popovič pointed to the major role which language plays in the formation and development of nations. Viewing the South Slavic peoples as a whole, Popovič ascribed their cultural backwardness to the centuries-long struggle with the Turkish conquerors. Finally, this Slovenian scholar campaigned for the creation of a single Latin-based alphabet to be used by all the Slavs and proposed his own variant thereof (Matešić 1979). Popovič objected to the use of two or three letters (digraphs and trigraphs in the manner of German) for the rendering of a single sound, advocating instead that each sound be represented by its own letter. Many of Popovič's ideas were taken up E. Kopitar, through whom they influenced other Slavic language-reform movements, particularly the reform of Serbian led by V. Karadžić (Петровский 1906: 482-484). Evidently Popovič also influenced Anton Feliks Deva, one of the first activists of the Slovenian revival and a pupil of Popovič's at the Jesuit secondary school in Ljubljana during 1745-1746 (Koruza 1977: 12).

The ethnic awareness of all the above-mentioned educated Slovenes was most evident in their attempts to promote the use of Slovenian. At the same time, a clearcut distinction between Slovenian and other Slavic languages is missing from their writings, a fact which reflects both the underdeveloped state of their ethnic consciousness and a naïve but conscientious attempt on their part to advance the rights of their

countrymen by emphasizing Slovenian affiliation with the Slavic peoples as a whole.

5. Grammatical codification and lexicographical realization: the primary factors in the lexical stabilization of literary Slovenian in the initial stage

According to most specialists in Slovenistics the appearance in 1768 of the Kranjsko grammar, written by the Augustinian Marko Pohlin (1735-1801), commences the initial phase of the Slovenian national revival. The last third of the eighteenth century is distinguished by the activities of Pohlin and other eminent representatives of Slovenian culture and enlightenment, such as A.F. Dev (1732-1786), O. Gutschmann (1727-1790), B. Kumerdej (1738-1805), and V. Vodnik (1758-1819). Below we analyze the development of literary Slovenian during this period with respect to both its grammatical codification and the various lexicographical projects which played an important role in the linguistic programs of the above-mentioned heralds of the Slovenian national revival.

Zlatko Vince has pointed out that the large corpus of Slovenian and Croatian dictionaries and grammars produced during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has attracted little attention on the part of scholars. According to Vince, this material must be thoroughly studied if we are to form a faithful picture of the development of literary language among the Slovenes and the Croats (Vince 1978: 546).

Although individual Slovenian grammars have been the subject of a number of studies, a comprehensive history of Slovenian grammars has yet to be written. The history of Slovenian grammars is part of the history of Slovenian linguistics. Until the middle of the nineteenth century grammars, dictionaries, and orthographic primers constituted the only works of a linguistic nature. Often a grammar, a dictionary, and an orthographic primer were published as a single book, and such works displayed the entire range of their compilers' views regarding the state of the Slovenian language. The extent to which those views have been "woven" into contemporary Slovenian linguistics is still an open question. In researching this linguistic heritage, we discover various directions in the development of scholarly thought which extend over the course of centuries - more than 400 years have passed since the appearance of

Bohorič's grammar, which was not only the first Slovenian grammar but also the first grammar to appear among the Southern Slavs.

Most contemporary linguists would agree that a grammar is one of the most representative kinds of texts with respect to a given culture and language. A grammar focuses on the communicative and philological problems of a given language collective and proposes solutions from both theoretical and practical perspectives (Мечковская 1985: 225).

The grammars of M. Pohlin, O. Gutschmann, and B. Kumerdej dealt with individual Slovenian dialects rather than Slovenian in the fullest sense, a reflection of the regional consciousness of their times.² Pohlin's and Kumerdej's grammars treated the Kranjsko dialect, Gutschmann's the Carinthian (Wendish) dialect.

Initially, the national revival movement and the struggle to broaden the functions of Slovenian were centered in Ljubljana. For the most part natives of the central regions of Slovenia (Krajna), the activists used the term *Kranjci* in their appeals to the populace and labeled their native language *kranjščina* in their philological works. As a rule, they disregarded the populace of other Slovenian territories and the particularities of the non-central dialects. E. Kopitar's "Grammatik der Slavischen Sprache in Krain, Karinten und Steyermark," published in Ljubljana in 1809, was to some extent an exception to the latter tendency. But although the title of Kopitar's work promised a characterization of the non-central Carinthian and Styrian dialects, the actual text contained no material on them.

In other Slovenian territories there was little evident consciousness of the need for national and linguistic unity. Thus, in the works of Gutschmann, the Carinthian most sympathetic to the ideas of the national revival, we find an uncritical collection of local Rozansk and Podjursk dialectal features. In Prekmurje the literary-written language variety

² At that time the consciousness of national unity had not taken root in many regions of Slovenian territory. This characteristic feature of the initial stage of the national revival is manifested in the lack of a term for the Slovenes in the sense of a separate people - the word *Slovenec* was employed in the sense of "Slav." *Slovenec* and *Sloven* first appear with the meaning "Slovene" in Gutschmann's Slovenian-German dictionary of 1789.

was based on the local dialects and employed a Hungarian orthographical system (Štefan Kuzmič).

Thus an underdeveloped sense of Slovene national unity, unawareness of the need for a single literary language, and regional and separatist features in literary activity characterize the initial phases of the Slovenian national revival and the formation of the Slovenian national literary language.

Against this background the creative ideas and practical achievements of Mark Pohlin with respect to the consolidation of the Slovenian *ethnos* are of great importance. Pohlin was the first to proclaim the need to publish secular, as opposed to simply religious, books in Slovenian. From 1781 to 1789 he himself published a number of German translations aimed at a popular readership: "Bukvice za rajtengo" ("Arithmetic"), "Kratkočasne uganke in čudne Kunšte" ("Riddles and charades"), "Kmetam za potrebo inu pomoč" ("For the needs and assistance of the peasantry").

Pohlin's Slovenian-German-Latin dictionary ("Tu malo besedišče treh jezikov" published in 1781) contained not only Slovenian lexical material but vocabulary from other Slavic languages which Pohlin drew from Czech and Croatian dictionaries. Some of these words have become established in contemporary literary usage: among such Czech borrowings we find *geslo*, *odpor*, and *pisarna*, among others; the Croatianisms include *bolest*, *budalost*, *oblika*, *podnebje*, and *zrcalo*.

The dictionary also features a number of items created by derivation on Pohlin's part which have also entered the contemporary lexicon: *dvomiti*, *prekop*, *preproda*, *rokodelec*, *stavek*, *testenina*, *tržišče*, *umetnost*. In addition, a number of specialized terms, including 430 botanical names, found a place in Pohlin's dictionary.

Pohlin possessed a definite ethnic consciousness, though he identified himself as a Krajnian, rather than as a Slovene. At the same time, mutual ethnic affinity of the Slavic people's was a notion which aroused Pohlin's sympathies, and in 1792 he attempted to publish an etymological dictionary under the title *Glossarium slavicum*, which contained the results of his research with respect to Czech and Croatian, as well as Slovenian words (Matešić 1979: 375). Pohlin actively promoted his ideas both in the press and among his students, who included Janez Mihelič, Jozef Zakotnik, and Valentin Vodnik, among others.

The confused linguistic situation and lack of a unified norm for written Slovenian necessitated the introduction of changes in the spelling system and the creation of new Slovenian grammars and dictionaries. Above all it was necessary to reach decisions with respect to two matters: the relation between the contemporary written language and the Protestant literary-written tradition, and the degree to which the written language should reflect those phenomena which had radically altered the phonetic structure of the Slovenian dialects.

Pohlin consciously parted with the written norms of Protestant literature, placing features of the Ljubljana dialect at the basis of his proposed norms. In comparison to Bohorič's grammar, that of Pohlin provides a more accurate picture of the contemporary state of the language.

Given the linguistic situation on Slovenian ethnic territory which we have described, Pohlin's grammar was bound to have its faults and it provoked sharp criticism on the part of many activists in the Slovenian national revival, particularly O. Gutschmann, B. Kumerdej, V. Vodnik, and E. Kopitar. The attacks were mainly directed at Pohlin's departure with Bohorič's orthography and his choice of the Ljubljana dialect as the basis for the literary-written language.

The first to take issue with Pohlin's innovations was Ozbald Gutschmann. A native of Carinthia, Gutschmann leaned upon the authority of Bohorič in authoring the best Slovenian grammar to appear in the eighteenth century. In Gutschmann's view, the language of the intelligentsia – i.e. scholars, preachers, and writers – should serve as a guide in the establishment of grammatical rules. He advocated "authentic" language, by which he meant the general literary language of the Slovenians, which he clearly distinguished from the territorial dialects. Gutschmann defended the right of the Slovenes to their own literary language by pointing out that the peoples genetically related to the Slovenes "occupied a vast territory extending from the North Sea to the Adriatic" (Matešić 1979: 375).

Gutschmann's Slovenian grammar ("Windische Sprachlehre," Celovec, 1777) attests to the advances taking place in Slovenian grammatical scholarship in the last third of the eighteenth century. Adhering to the actual facts of the language, Gutschmann gives a scrupulous presentation of locative case forms and makes no mention of the vocative case (which

had dropped out of the Slovenian declensional system) or genitive forms which are uncharacteristic of Slovenian.

He also includes certain of Pohlin's innovations with respect to inflection and graphics.

In 1789 Gutschmann published his "Deutsch-Windisches Wörterbuch," which became a valuable lexicographical guide for many years to follow. Alongside the lexical items found in previously published dictionaries, Gutschmann's dictionary included words from the Carinthian dialects and new formations of his own invention. Gutschmann illustrated his definitions with many folk expressions and sayings. Among those of Gutschmann's neologisms preserved in contemporary Slovenian are: *delavnica*, *dnevnik*, *ladevje*, *ljubosumnost*, *novice*, *obljubiti*, *odbor*, *sladkor* (Breznik 1967).

Let us sum up. The initial period of the Slovenian national revival was characterized by notable achievements in the area of grammatical description and lexicography. The phonetic system is analyzed in a manner which takes account of Slovenian innovations; the case-system is presented with more precision; verbs of perfective and imperfective aspect are differentiated; verbal forms are treated from a functional perspective; and features of syntax and word-formation are also discussed. The vocabulary is considerably enriched, and attempts are made to establish a terminological lexicon.

With respect to the state of the Slovenian lexicon at this time, grammars and dictionaries are the most representative texts at our disposal. Moreover, the Slovenian grammars and dictionaries of the last third of the eighteenth century reflect various aspects of the culture of that time and thus constitute a valuable source for the study of Slovenian cultural history.

The Slovenian grammars of the last third of the eighteenth century accurately reflect the character of current scholarly thought in general. As a reglamentation of the language practice of speakers, a normative grammar reflects the linguistic ideology of a society – both in the principles which it lays down and in its selection of linguistic material for presentation. Finally, the Slovenian grammars of this time enable us to estimate the extent to which the Slovenian language was taught and studied.

REFERENCES

- Breznik, A. 1967, *Življenje besed*. Maribor.
- Domej, T. 1979, Slovenska jezikoslovna misel na Koroškem v XVIII. stoletju. In: *Obdobje razsvetljenstva v slovenskem jeziku, književnosti in kulturi*. Ljubljana.
- Havránek, B. 1936, Spisovný jazyk český. *Československá vlastivěda*. Řada II, S. 4. Praha.
- Koruza, I. 1975/1976, K problematiki slovenskega preroda. *Jezik in slovstvo*. T. XXI. St. 4. Ljubljana.
- Koruza, I. 1977, Spremná beseda – Pisanice od lepih umetnosti. In: *Monumenta literarum slovenicarum*. V. 14. S. 6.
- Lenček, R.L. 1968, The Theme of the Greek Koine in the Concept of a Slavic Common Language and Matija Majar's Model. In: *American Contributions to the Sixth International Congress of Slavists*. Vol. I. Prague.
- Matešić, I. 1979, O slavenskoj svijesti i njezinoj ulozi u razdoblju slovenskoga prosvjetiteljstva. In: *Obdobje razsvetljenstva v slovenskem jeziku, književnosti in kulturi*. Ljubljana.
- Melik, V. 1979, Zgodovinske osnove začetkov slovenskega narodnega gibanja. In: *Obdobje razsvetljenstva v slovenskem jeziku, književnosti in kulturi*. Ljubljana, 421–424.
- Rigler, J. 1968, *Začetki slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Ljubljana.
- Rupel, M. 1969, *Valvasorjevo berilo*. Ljubljana.
- Slodnjak, A. 1968, *Slovensko slovstvo*. Ljubljana.
- Valvasor, J.W. 1689, *Die ehre des Hertzogthums Crain*. Nürnberg.
- Vince, Z. 1978, *Putovina hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb.
- Мечковская, Н.Б. 1985, *Ранние восточнославянские грамматики*. Минск.
- Мыльников, А.С. 1977, *Эпоха просвещения в Чешских землях: идеология, национальное самосознание, культура*. М.
- Петровский, Н.М. 1906, *Первые годы деятельности В. Капитара*. Казань.
- Чуркина, И.В. 1985, Становление национальных идей в словенской художественной культуре. В кн.: *Концепции национальной художественной культуры*. М., 186–208.

(to be continued)

